Attorney Docket No. AUS920030688US1
Serial No. 10/692,166
Response to Office Action mailed March 12, 2007

I. REMARKS

1.   The examiner rejected claims 2, 5, 7, 10, 11, 17, 20, 22, 25, 26, 33, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The examiner rejected the claims because of the use of determine if or determine whether, and the examiner stated that such language is optional and does necessarily present a tangible result. Applicant has amended each of the above identified claims to recite a non-conditional action producing a result.

2.   The examiner rejected claims 7, 8, 15, 22-23, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The examiner rejected the above identified claims because they contained terms lacking an antecedent basis. Applicant has amended each of the above identified claims to overcome the rejection.

3.   The examiner rejected claims 1-39 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Li et al. (US Patent 5,418,950, hereinafter "Li").

Li discloses a graphical user interface that a user can build one or more SQL SELECT statements. The graphical user interface comprises seven panes to be used by a user to create a query. Li builds the query from a user interaction with a sequence of seven panes. In contrast, applicant creates the query by entering only the fields, at least one filter, and at least one sort criteria. (See FIG. 3, 204 and paragraph [0034], lines 5-6) The query is then built automatically.

Applicant further distinguishes over Li because the present invention *automatically* screens all available tables in a database to identify only the tables necessary to perform the SQL

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030688US1
Serial No. 10/692,166
Response to Office Action mailed March 12, 2007

search, then creates a clause for the query that only searches the identified necessary tables.   The

present invention has advantages over Li in that the present invention automatically determines

necessary tables based on the initial query, rather than having a user select a set of columns from

all available columns.   The present invention eliminates the need for the user to make the

selection of columns by automating the process of identifying the set of necessary tables.

Moreover, the user in applicant's invention must perform only one step—entry of the fields,

filters and sort criteria—and no others. In Li, the database tables are "created to support the

view" and "use all or a subset of one or more base tables or views." (4:59-60) If grouping is

necessary in Li, columns to be used as a base must be specified in order to place the retrieved

rows into groups in the report. (3:21-23).

Because the present invention automatically performs functions that require user

interactions in the Li reference, and because the present invention removes steps for the user

from the solution disclosed by Li, the applicant submits that the claims as presently presented are

in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Registration No. 37,720
Gordon & Rees LLP
Suite 2800
2100 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201
214-231-4660
214-461-4053 (fax)
rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com

Page 18 of 18